

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN RANAE GLEEN CANDLER,
Plaintiff,
v.
JOHN & JANE DOES, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 1:23-cv-00459-JLT-SAB (PC)

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
TO SUBSTITUTE, WITHOUT PREJUDICE

(ECF No. 43)

Plaintiff is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Currently before the Court is Plaintiff's motion for substitution, filed November 8, 2023. Plaintiff seeks to substitute the names of three Doe Defendants. (ECF No. 43.)

As an initial matter, Plaintiff's motion is unsigned and such filing cannot be considered by the Court. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11(a); Local Rule 131. Further, on October 31, 2023, the Court denied Plaintiff's first motion to substitute, without prejudice, because the Court found the operative complaint stated a cognizable claim against only one Doe Defendant. (ECF No. 41 at 2.) The Court advised Plaintiff that if he is seeking to amend his complaint to add additional Defendants, he must file a motion to amend, along with a proposed second amended complaint which is complete within itself. Local Rule 220. (Id.) Inasmuch as Plaintiff again seeks to amend the complaint to substitute the name of three, instead of one, Doe Defendants, the motion must be

1 denied. Plaintiff is advised that he should review and comply with the Court's October 31, 2023,
2 order in seeking to amend and/or substitute the identity of the Doe Defendant(s). Accordingly,
3 Plaintiff's motion to substitute, filed on November 8, 2023, is denied, without prejudice.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: **November 9, 2023**


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE